

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	O. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/001,497	10/001,497 11/14/2001		Leola Henry	PIL0123/US	3217	
33072	7590	06/16/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
KAGAN BI	•		TRAN LIE	TRAN LIEN, THUY		
,		SLAND BUILDING		A DOWN TO THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE PERTY OF	DARED SER ADDR	
221 MAIN S'	TREET N	ORTH	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
STILLWATE	ER, MN	55082	1761 ·			

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/001,497	HENRY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
LAUMINIO	Alt Offic	

	·						
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Lien T. Tran	1761					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	Iress				
HE REPLY FILED 30 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is late event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITH							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on peen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened standard in the control of the control of the shortened standard in the control of t	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension of (2)	on fee under 37) as set forth in (b)				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must I 	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal	of the appeal.				
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>	·		` ,				
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
appeal; and/or	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))		ejected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	121. See attached Notice of Non-C	ompliant Amendmen	t (PTOL-324).				
5. $oxed{oxed}$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .		<i>i</i> ill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-17</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apperry and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	ails to provide a (1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the control of the contr	on of the status of the claims after o	entry is below or atta	ched.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. 	ut does NOT place the application i	in condition for allow	ance because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).							
13.	p	LIEN TRAN PRIMARY EXAMINER					
	.	CALADINER					
		900p1700					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the argument is not persuasive for reason of record. Additionally, applicant argues there is not motivation to take a biscuit product out of its ordinary environment and place it is in a different environment.. This argument is not persuasive because the dough disclosed by Hansen et al is not intended for just one type of dough product. The dough is used to make different type of dough product including non-laminated dough product. The making of biscuit product is well known in the art as shown by the cookbook. As to the configuration of the biscuit swirl, dough products come in many different shapes, form, kind. One would be motivated to place a filling with a biscuit product because biscuit is typically consumed with filling. Applicant argues if one were to follow the teaching of Hahn, one would have placed the filling on top of the biscuit. This argument is not persuasive because the placement of filling in a dough product varies and Hahn teaches placing of filling between adjacent dough layers. Dough products having filling adjacent dough layers are well known; some typical examples include cinnamon rolls, danish, pecan roll, etc.. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to place filling adjacent dough layers including biscuit dough if such appearance is wanted in the product. Varying the look of dough product is routinely done in this technology. For example, there are many different types, forms, shapes, sizes to cookie, cake, roll etc., products. Applicant argues forming larger sized is a challenge as evident as the disclosure of Hansen on column 3. Hansen et al discuss the expanding characteristic of small and larger size product. There is no discussion of how the difficulty of forming larger size product. Changing the size of the product would have been within the skill of one in the art. It is not uncommon to find the same baked product in many different sizes. There are bagels that come in bite-size and there are bagels that come in much larger sizes. .